



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,312	12/21/2000	Sascha Baumeister	DE919990096	2057

7590 05/06/2004

Blanche E. Schiller, Esq.  
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG, P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, NY 12203

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

13

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,312

Applicant(s)

BAUMEISTER ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Remarks*

1. In response to communications filed on 09-February-2004, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17 are amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-18 are presently pending in the application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "said one or more file resource manager" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim since the base claim (claim 1, as amended) recites "a file resource manager". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2175

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that said subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sedlar (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,916) in view Horikiri et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,501.)

As to claim 1, Sedlar teaches a method for managing (see Abstract) a hierarchical file system (see figure 6, and see column 6, lines 54-61) comprising:

providing a transaction manager (see Abstract; see column 13, line 53 through column 14, line 16; and see column 14, line 66 through column 15, line 21, where “transaction manager” is read on “database server” managing the “transaction database”), the transaction manager implementing transactional functionality (see column 14, lines 45-53, where “transactional functionality” is read on “insert, save, update, delete, commit and roll-back”) to effectuate consistent transactional changes to one or more files of the hierarchical file system (see column 13, lines 53-61) and to data of one or more resources separate from the hierarchical file system, wherein the data of one or more resources is related to the one or more files of the hierarchical file system (see column 7, lines 7-13, column 21, lines 31-43, and see column 28, lines 40-51), and wherein the consistent transactional changes are initiated by the transaction manager (see column 13, lines 53-65, and see column 17, lines 13-24.)

Sedlar does not teach:

Art Unit: 2175

a file resource manager, the file resource manager managing the hierarchical file system; and the transaction manager implementing transactional functionality via, in part, the file resource manager.

Horikiri et al teaches a resource management method and apparatus (see Abstract), in which he teaches a file resource manager (see Abstract), the file resource manager managing the hierarchical file system (see column 4, lines 7-9, see column 28, lines 40-52, see column 21, lines 49-60, and see figures 13A-B); and the transaction manager implementing transactional functionality via, in part, the file resource manager (see column 15, lines 13-25, and see column 31, lines 20-32.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sedlar to include a file resource manager; the file resource manager managing the hierarchical file system; and the transaction manager implementing transactional functionality via, in part, the file resource manager.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sedlar by the teachings of Horikiri et al, because including a file resource manager, the file resource manager managing the hierarchical file system; and the transaction manager implementing transactional functionality via, in part, the file resource manager, would enable the system to utilize resource managers as a plurality of processes operated by performing mutual communications over a single or a plurality of computer systems, as taught by Horikiri et al (see column 8, lines 23-30.)

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 2, Sedlar as modified teaches in which the transaction manager implements a commit and/or rollback facility (see Sedlar, column 14, lines 45-53.)

As to claim 3, Sedlar as modified teaches in which the file resource manager (see Horikiri et al, Abstract) is arranged for communicating with the file system (see Horikiri et al, column 10, lines 37-45) via a protocol directed to cover changes made to the file system (see Sedlar, column 16, lines 20-33, and see column 27, line 62 through column 28, line 7.)

As to claim 9, Sedlar as modified teaches in which the one or more file resource manager (see Horikiri et al, Abstract) is implemented utilizing a stacked file system (see Horikiri et al, figure 25, and see column 31, line 54 through column 32, line 6.)

As to claim 10, Sedlar as modified teaches in which the file resource manager (see Horikiri et al, Abstract) is implemented in the file system itself (see Horikiri et al, column 20, lines 61-66.)

As to claim 11, Sedlar as modified teaches in which the file resource manager (see Horikiri et al, Abstract) processes commands (see Sedlar, column 5, lines 3-16) issued by the transaction manager arranged for cooperating with a database management system (see Sedlar, column 5, lines 17-23.)

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 12, Sedlar as modified teaches a method (see Sedlar, Abstract) for managing a file system (see Sedlar, figure 6, and see column 6, lines 54-61) comprising using the transaction manager (see Sedlar, see column 13, line 53 through column 14, line 16; and see column 14, line 66 through column 15, line 21, where “transaction manager” is read on “database server” managing the “transaction database”) implemented for a cooperation with the file system (see Sedlar, column 21, lines 54-59.)

As to claim 13, Sedlar teaches a computer system (see Abstract) being able to access a hierarchical file system (see figure 6) which is manageable by a transaction manager according to a method of managing a hierarchical file system (see column 4, lines 51-66.)

For the remaining teachings of this claim, the applicant is kindly directed to remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 14, Sedlar teaches a computer program for execution in a data processing system comprising computer program code portions (see Abstract, where “techniques for managing files in a computer system” is taught. Also see figure 18, and see column 43, lines 1-27. It is inherent that “computers” run on “computer programs”.)

For the remaining teachings of this claim, the applicant is kindly directed to remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 15, Sedlar teaches a computer program product stored on a computer usable medium comprising computer readable program means for causing a computer to perform

Art Unit: 2175

the method of managing a hierarchical file system (see figure 18, and see column 43, lines 1-27.)

For the remaining teachings of this claim, the applicant is kindly directed to remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 16, Sedlar as modified teaches wherein the files have different file formats (see Sedlar, column 37, lines 31-67, and see column 40, lines 32-60.)

As to claim 17, Sedlar as modified teaches wherein the transaction manager (see Sedlar, see column 13, line 53 through column 14, line 16; and see column 14, line 66 through column 15, line 21, where “transaction manager” is read on “database server” managing the “transaction database”) implements transactional functionality (see Sedlar, column 14, lines 45-53) to effectuate changes to files of the hierarchical file system (see Sedlar, column 13, lines 53-61) notwithstanding that the files have unknown file formats (see Sedlar, column 37, lines 42-56, and see column 42, lines 21-33.)

As to claim 18, Sedlar as modified teaches wherein the one or more resources managed by the one or more managers comprises data in a database (see Sedlar column 5, lines 4-17, and see column 14, lines 19-29, where “resource” is read on “database” and the “manager” is read on “the server”, and see Horikiri et al, column 44, lines 28-46, and see column 46, line 59 through column 47, line 20.)



*Allowable Subject Matter*

6. Claim 4-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Sedlar (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,916), Coleman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,154), Horikiri et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,501), and Khalidi et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,799), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

In which the protocol is XD SM or is derivable from XD SM, or comprises XD SM-equivalent functions, as claimed in claim 4.

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent from the objected to dependent claim 4.

The prior art of record, Sedlar (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,916), Coleman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,154), Horikiri et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,501), and Khalidi et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,799), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the file resource manager is arranged for communicating with the file system via a protocol directed to cover changes made to the file system, and wherein the protocol is

Art Unit: 2175

XDSM or is derivable from XDSM, or comprises XDSM-equivalent functions, as claimed in claims 6, 7, and 8.

*Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 09-February-2004 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

*Conclusion*

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2175

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to methods and systems of managing resources in the transaction management environments in general:


Patent/Pub. No.	Issued to	Cited for teaching
US006052695A	Abe et al.	Transaction System In Cooperation with Resource Manager.

11. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

April 20, 2004

  
DOV POPOVICI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100